The REFORMED JOURNAL

— 4 — No. 7 A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion July-August, 1954

SFTS LIBRARY

"As a Very Lovely Song"

by ELCO OOSTENDORP*

THE CONCLUDING VERSES of Ezekiel 33 form a passage of great interest to preachers of the Word of God. Here the Lord Himself informs his prophet as to the effect of his message upon his hearers. It would be enlightening if all ministers could have such a reliable and penetrating report on what their people think of them! No doubt in many cases it would be just as discouraging as this message for Ezekiel. Although the exiles came to hear him with great eagerness and interest, and acknowledged that he brought them the word of Jehovah, their attitude was not sound. They "enjoyed the sermon" — to use a common phrase — but it produced no effect in the form of action. Far from being an innocent matter this reaction was hardening them for judgment (vs. 33). The Jews were committing what we usually call the "aesthetic fallacy"; they made the mistake of thinking that an emotional reaction of pleasure in the beauty and grandeur of the message was a substitute for obedience to the Word of the Word.

One wonders how much of our religious activity, especially attendance at worship services and meetings featuring prominent speakers, is of the same kind. Are not our people also guilty of the aesthetic fallacy in thinking that the sermon has accomplished its purpose when they have enjoyed it? In particular those who like to run from place to place following so-called popular men. And is there not a temptation here for ministers to feel that they have accomplished their aim if the people keep coming to hear them? Is there not a danger that we forget that worship, particularly the ministration of the Word, is not entertainment, but preparation for action in the service of God?

* * *

THIS by no means implies that there is no room for beauty, for the satisfaction of our aesthetic sense, in preaching the message that God gives his people. The Bible contradicts that conclusion very emphaticly. Many passages and even entire books of Scripture are unsurpassed in literature both for beauty of style and content. Where can we find more thrilling stories, bolder imagery, sweeter poetry or clearer teaching? And very naturally the sermons based on such passages and true to their spirit must needs be more or less beautiful. God is a God of beauty as well as of truth and holiness and love. When He equips with eloquence and stylistic talent, when He gives powers of voice and personality that compel attention of the multitudes, it would be sin not to use them. These can become mighty means to the end God intends, namely, the conversion of sinners and edification of saints. The fallacy and sin occur when people take these things to be ends in themselves.

Human nature tends too easily to make this mistake. That accounts in part for the great attraction of ritualism. The pageantry of the Romish Mass, and even the chanted prayers of an Anglican rector fascinate the ear and eye. That is why our Calvinistic fathers reacted to an extreme simplicity in their services and church architecture. Even the organs must be si-

* Rev. Oostendorp is minister of the Christian Reformed Church at Lacombe, Alberta, Canada.

IN THIS ISSUE

"As a Very Lovely Song" ..... *Elco H. Oostendorp* 1
"Love Thou Thy Land" ..... *John Timmerman* 2
Calvin and the Lord's Supper — II ..... *Lewis B. Smedes* 4
Luther Was Not Alone ..... *Leonard Verduin* 6
Foreign Languages for the Christian School Child ..... *Clarence Boersma* 8
Solomon Froeligh, D.D. ..... *William C. Kiessel, Jr.* 11
Bible Teaching in the Schools ..... *Nicholas H. Beversluis* 13
Letters to the Journal 16

"As a Very Lovely Song" — Continued

lenced and all choirs banned lest worship become entertaining rather than instructing. In the measure that we are getting away from this severely anti-ritualistic position, and are making use of many instrumental and psychological aids to worship, in the measure that our old frame churches are being replaced by temples of brick and stone, in the measure that culture is making an impact upon us who have emerged from our immigrant isolation and backwardness, will we have to guard against the aesthetic fallacy.

* * *

HERE AGAIN we meet one of those perennial tensions of life, of which history gives so many illustrations. On the one hand, there is the cultural mandate that we must not only develop in knowledge and power, but also in appreciating and using the beautiful. On the other hand there is the indisputable fact that increasing cultural development often is accompanied by decreasing seriousness in doing the will of God. Although one must be on guard against oversimplification, there is no doubt that the rise of "storefront churches" from within the old denominations is one illustration of this tendency. When a Church "arrives" and loses its sense of mission its message becomes a lovely song that soothes and lulls to sleep instead of rousing to action in the service of God.

Twice in these verses the Lord rebukes the people because they heard the prophet's words, but did them not. This is an emphasis that is found throughout the Bible. Not only the Old Testament prophets, but our Chief Prophet, the Lord Jesus Himself, experienced this reaction. "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" was his searching question to the multitudes who followed him and testified that never man spoke as he. Not those who hear the word, but those that do it shall enter the kingdom of heaven.

* * *

IN THIS CONNECTION an objection may be rising in your mind. Surely not every sermon calls for action. What about a Catechism sermon on Lord's Day 8 of the Heidelberg Catechism (The Trinity), or some other doctrinal theme? Or a comforting message designed to calm fears and sooth the troubled breast? The constant emphasis on doing the word seems to lead to pragmatism and activism which are so contrary to our doctrinal approach.

The answer to that objection can easily be found. It is that by action the Lord does not mean only outward deeds. This is plain from verse 31, "For with their mouth they show great love, but their heart goeth after their gain." From the heart are the issues of life, and therefore God seeks response from the heart. Even in the case of a doctrinal sermon there can be commitment to the truth, faith which accepts it, and love for Him of whose being and works all Christian doctrine speaks. In that sense faith is "the work of God" (John 6:29). Such faith, being alive, must also produce works. Preaching may never aim at mere indoctrination, but seek to produce appropriation.

* * *

THE GOSPEL is indeed a lovely song. Let it be sung in beautiful words worthy of the greatness of the theme, and in a pleasant voice to the accompaniment of instruments in perfect harmony. It is the song of our Beloved and his vineyard. How wonderful the care God has bestowed on that vineyard! But woe to the vine when He comes seeking grapes, and finds only sour ones, wholly bad. Committing the aesthetic fallacy is serious business because the beautiful sword of the Lord is sharp and powerful; it is two-edged. To those who hear and obey it is the power of God to salvation. But to those who only hear and enjoy it is the savour of death unto death. When the trumpet sounds and we only thrill to the music and do not repent our blood will be upon our own heads. God forbid that it should be said of us: "They hear the words but do them not; their heart goeth after their gain."

The REFORMED JOURNAL

VOLUME IV NO. 7
JULY-AUGUST, 1954

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD
Rev. Harry R. Boer, Dr. James Daane, Rev. George Stob, Dr. Henry Stob, Dr. Henry Zylstra

Published each month by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
Subscription price: $2.00 per year
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Postoffice at Grand Rapids, Mich.
Address all subscriptions and communications to:
THE REFORMED JOURNAL
255 Jefferson Avenue, S. E.
Grand Rapids 3, Mich.

"Love Thou Thy Land"

by JOHN TIMMERMAN*

IT HAS ALWAYS struck me as a faintly ridiculous oddity that our national anthem begins with the shrill, slangy ejaculation, "Oh, say!" words introducing a song which only a superbly gifted soprano can sing. Our national anthem is symbolic of the irony of American poetry as a national poetry. The only major American poet, Whitman, who has explicitly devoted himself to American themes, the American land and its people, has alienated many readers by his "gab" and "barbaric yawp." Except for a few unqualified masterpieces, Whitman has tumbled the vast mosaic of American life into his poems and left to the reader the problem of pattern. He also shouts "Oh say!" and pours out a song too often shrill and too often a muddle. America is worth singing about, but few of our poets have done so in a way to move the American people.

America is an epic, a thrilling story on an ascending curve. Three hundred years ago the white men waded onto a wild new land that cost seven lives out of eight during the early years. Heat and cold, the sharp changes of the spectacular American climate, toma-

* Dr. Timmerman is professor of English Language and Literature at Calvin College.

vk and wolves took their iron toll. t the wave of the future rolled west- rd, and the colonies grew fat and de a nation, which prospered till the il War ran a red gash through the d. The North poured out products, t the war wrecked the magnolias and white, splendid cities of the South. en then the wave was rolling west- rd over the tall grasses, over the le plains to the mountain barriers. t soon the lonely whistles of the at trains echoed through the passes, l the continent became a nation. In 90 the frontier was closed, and the ited States began to thrust its big oulders into world history.

* * *

THIS STORY of many-colored endor is endlessly fascinating. But r poets have neglected it. They have scribed the land in brilliant poems, t not man's tumultuous history on t land. Emily Dickinson oscillates ween simple natural objects and the ite distances of eternity. Thoreau l Emerson travelled much in Con- d and Indian mysticism. Whittier l Lowell are provincial. Longfellow ikes the epic note in *Hiawatha* which s enjoyed an enormous popularity. r contemporary poets have written th genius of regions of American . Frost's *North of Boston* is a vol- e of authentic New Englanders, intering their lives on rocky soil; ndburg's *Collected Poems* gives the obbing texture of life in metropolis d on prairie; Macleish gets the omise and color of America. But who es the story? Hart Crane wrote a illiant symbolic poem *The Bridge*, th striking scenes in nervous ythms, but also with elusive subtlety d without narrative. There is only e American poet who has according the full measure of his gifts done stice to the fabulous history of Amer- an life. That is Stephen Vincent net.

I do not mean to imply, of course, at a poet can write an epic covering r entire history. By an epic treat- ent of our history I mean the selec- on and treatment of some key or cru- al situation of national and typical portance, some central action that oulds the national life for years. Such epic would employ a figure or fig- es of national importance operating a context of historical facts that em- dy national destiny. This Benet does. There have been other epics treating American life, but they lie in the dust of famous libraries awaiting the reluctant hands of the Ph.D. candidate.

* * *

BENET is worth reading. He is, as poets go, popular. That fact should not constitute a fault. After all, the ability to wrest meanings from involved poems should not be the union card to an enjoyment of poems. Benet has written two poems of great interest to Americans: *John Brown's Body*, an epic of the Civil War, and *Western Star*, a projected epic of which Benet had completed one book at the time of his unexpected death. I wish to interest people in these poems because they are nobly patriotic, truly poetic, and constantly interesting. They deepen our love of country and our love of poetry.

Western Star deals with our earliest settlements at Plymouth and on the James River. In its pages we hear:

> *. . . the first and stammering voices of the men*
> *Who cling like wasps to the rim of the continent.*

It is a heartbreaking story of hope, struggle, disillusion, and sudden death. How this largely anonymous people suffered in a grim world! Death rode on the poisoned arrow, lurked in the treacherous swamp fevers, numbed through the harsh wind, and killed one by one, and then in droves. The setting is a wild America we can hardly imagine, an America almost ghostly in its loneliness. The forest covers the fort at the slightest surrender, the little men chip at its vast edges in fear. Adventure, greed, idealism, and religious fervor supported the settlers. Benet gives you the texture of that life; you hunger, thirst, groan, and hope as you read the pages.

John Brown's Body is an almost unflaggingly interesting poem of four hundred pages. Granting its lack of unity, its "patchwork colors," its "hundred visions" that do not fuse into an organic whole, yet the reader will experience that war as if its thunder and smoke enveloped him. It is a dense and crowded canvas: gnarled men from New England, suave planters from the South, husky prairie farmers, and reluctant city conscripts heave through the book. There are the dishonest rhetoricians, the scheming wharf rats of politics as well as the men of large and noble vision. Many great Americans take on new life. The War in its fury hurls men over vast areas of superbly described terrain; it rushes men into the bleak muzzles of big guns; it blasts cities and fertile fields; it harrows the lover's heart, brings sorrow into humble homes. The great battles come alive. Here is the war; its misery, waste, horror, and glory. Here is impressionistic history of a high order.

Benet paints in bold and striking colors to suit a land of glare and contrast. He gets the glow and the music of the American scene "the pure elixir, the American thing." To capture the nervous vigor of this land, Benet uses varying verse forms. The reflective passages employ a loose blank verse, the battle pieces sing in a rough, irregular long line, the courtesy and dash of the South expresses itself in a light rimed metre. Interspersed among the longer lines are swift and striking lyrics. The verses form a deliberately loose pattern suggestive of the range and tempo of the action. The rhythm pounds out the forceful substance.

* * *

POETRY has immemorially used great national themes. Bards chanted the deeds of colorful national heroes before epics were written. Benet is thus in a great tradition, a tradition which unites the hearts of a people through a great poem. Benet is not as

COMBINED ISSUE, JULY - AUGUST

This number is the combined July - August issue of The Reformed Journal. —Eds.

"Love Thou Thy Land"

Continued

great as some American poets, but none has so effectively dealt with American history. His is a refreshing voice in a sick and introverted age.

Contemporary American poetry is difficult. Introspective, symbolic, tortuous, the meanings — if there are meanings in the traditional sense — often escape even the seasoned reader. The verse patterns are often hard to appreciate. The dissonant rhythms, the irregular and often spasmodic patterns reflect the hesitancies of a bewildered age. Of course, they also reflect an age of constant experimentation in which original poets are beating out new rhythms to express new moods, but it is difficult to sift the wheat from the chaff. Many readers are baffled and vexed and read no more poems, and thus a source of spiritual enrichment runs dry for them. Benet, however, is objective and clear; he tells a great story in memorable language; by treating a noble subject nobly, he revives or creates in us a love of good poetry.

Benet's epic poems perform still another valuable service; they revive or form in readers certain stock responses that are currently in dange of wasting away — the responses of patriotism and a realization of the worth of man. In our vast and populous country, and in our chaotic and troubled world, these responses are in danger of erosion and disappearance. We may minimize stock responses, but our very existence, as C. S. Lewis convincingly shows in his book *A Preface to Paradise Lost,* depends upon stock responses. Children, he says, "like to dabble in dirt; they have to be taught the stock response to it." So men, naturally selfish and exploitative, have to be taught the values of patriotism and human dignity. They also, as we see so clearly today, have to be taught the methods by which to preserve these values. These values, "which we need in order to be human" are priceless; we can thank the poet who so persuasively demonstrates both the values and the methods of preserving them. Benet's poetry is humanistic, horizontal; his values depend upon the unacknowledged divine order. Humanism tries to preserve religious values without religious faith. This indicates the limits of his vision; but that vision is broad and deep enough to move Americans to nobler citizenship.

Calvin and the Lord's Supper

by LEWIS B. SMEDES

II

In my previous article I tried to show that Calvin considered the eating and drinking of bread and wine in the sacrament to be truly and really *efficacious* symbols. The sacrament is a sign and seal of God's promise. But it is no *ordinary* sign and no *ordinary* seal; it is a sign and seal which affects what it signifies and seals. With the partaking of the sacrament there is a real participation in the life of Christ. And it is a participation in the whole of Christ, human as well as divine. I tried to point out that Calvin held to a real union of the believer with Christ, a real participation of the believer in the life of Christ, and that the sacrament was an effective means of granting this participation. I concluded by saying that there were two important remarks that had to be made for a proper understanding of the effectiveness of the sacrament in this respect.

* * *

The first is that the participation in Christ offered in the Lord's Supper is accomplished through the Holy Spirit. This in itself is a noteworthy truth, often too lightly passed over. We have here the remarkable fact that the Holy Spirit brings to us the humanity of Christ. Christ left the earth physically; but through the Holy Spirit He is yet with us, entire and complete in His humanity as well as His divinity. We have not begun to plummet the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Christ, who is human as really as He is divine. This is a live topic in theology today; it is occupying the attention of continental Protestants, Barthian and others, as well as Catholics. What is the relationship between the Spirit and the ascended Lord? Some Catholics are saying that the Holy Spirit is the natural overflow of the life of the glorified incarnate Lord and constitutes the extension of the incarnation. But Calvin too was busy with the matter, anticipating much of the modern discussion. He does not claim to have solved the problem; indeed, he suggests that it must remain a mystery. But, though a mystery, he assumes its reality; the Spirit gives to us the life of the *humanity* of Christ, and it is this participation in Christ that brings immortality and sanctification to our own humanity. The Spirit performs it. This does not take away from the significance of the sacrament. It puts the cause of the sacramental efficacy in the proper place— not locally in the material elements, but in the Spirit.

Secondly, there is the relationship of faith to the sacrament. Christ is really given by the power of the Spirit. Yet He is not received without faith. Faith is an empty vessel that carries away the grace of Christ from the sacrament. Faith does not create Christ in the sacrament. But Christ is not received without faith. Lack of faith does not remove the efficacy of the sacrament; but it does separate Christ from the sacrament for the faithless celebrant. To man without faith the sacrament is an empty sign. To man with faith it is the medium of a real reception of Christ and His life.

In summary, we may say that the inexpendable participation of the believer in Christ, so important to Calvin, is in a special way made effective in the sacrament of the sacred meal. Christ is really given with, though he is not locally confined to, the elements. Hence, the importance of the sacrament is that it not only confirms God's promise to our minds, but is actually the occasion for the fulfillment of the promise, namely, that Christ's flesh will be meat and Christ's blood drink to our souls.

The conclusion is that the sacrament in Calvin's theology offers a real and true participation in the divine-human Christ. This refutes the Catholic charge of fictionalism and unreality. It also opens for us marvelously inspiring and edifying perspectives of the Lord's institution of His holy supper. The significance of the sacrament corresponds to the importance of the idea of mystical union. If the latter is indispensible to the Christian life, so is the former. People are often bored with the "ordinary" means of grace that Christ gave us. They look for more from mass revival meetings, radio evangelism, and inspirational speeches. But it is the Word and the Sacrament that Christ gave us. And He knew what we needed. It is not a matter simply of

spiration and feeling, but of a mys-
al and mysterious reality that goes
eper than our feelings. Not what we
l, but what the Spirit does is of first
portance. This is why the celebra-
n of the supper is so very significant.
This also is why we should not stop
an inquiry into the nature of the sac-
nent, but go on to the manner of cel-
rating it. What does Calvin's doc-
ne of the nature of the sacrament
ggest as to its celebration? I wish
discuss two things in this connec-
n.

* * *

WHAT ABOUT the frequency of
ebration? It is well known that
lvin insisted that the holy supper be
ebrated at least once a week. It has
en suggested that this was a Catholic
nnant in his thinking. It is more
ely, however, that it stems from his
derstanding of the nature of the sac-
ment as a genuine means of grace.
deed, it was precisely the Roman
actice of allowing celebration to be
infrequent as once per year that he
volted against. This, he said, was an
vention of the devil! What would
lvin say of four times a year? Per-
ps a compromise of Wormwood? Cal-
n's argument is that since the sacra-
nt is a means of imparting Christ's
e to us, celebration should be very
equent. It should be frequent because
all need the grace of Christ so bad-

Our Church Order says that the
rd's Supper should be celebrated *at
st* once every two or three months.
least! This means that our present
actice meets the very minimum re-
uirements of the Church Order. Dordt
d it that every two months was the
inimum. The Hague Synod of 1586
lded Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas
the bimonthly celebrations. In 1905,
e Dutch churches altered the mini-
um to once every two or three
onths. But it is to be noted that these
ere mostly concessions to reality; at
st persecutions made frequent cele-
ation difficult, and then later synods
mply bowed to the fact that bimonth-
celebrations had become the prac-
ce.

The fact remains that, with nothing
reventing us from doing otherwise, we
e satisfied with the bare minimum.
ven the special Holy Day celebrations
re rare. Good Friday would seem to
e the most natural time of all to "com-memorate the Lord's death" with the sacrament. Yet to my knowledge, none of our churches do. Is it worth making a fuss about? Perhaps not. Abraham Kuyper held that we were entirely wrong in not kneeling while at congregational prayer, but he considered it discrete only to hope that the churches would in time realize their own liturgical deficiency. We may do likewise. But we should be aware that our liturgical practice is not in harmony with the reformed idea of the spiritual benefit of the sacrament.

It is said that more frequent celebration would detract from "its sacredness and effectiveness."[18] How frequent celebration could detract from the effectiveness of the Holy Spirit in imparting to us the life of Christ is really impossible for me to understand. One could just as well say that two sermons per Sunday detract from the efficacy of God's Word. This view makes one wonder whether we really believe that the Lord's Supper is a means of grace. If it is a means of grace effectuated by the Spirit, then surely greater frequency than the bare minimum will not detract from its effectiveness. Nor need anything other than "improper" celebration detract from its sacredness. At least I fail, at this point, to see why it should.

It has also been suggested that such emphasis as this article gives to the sacrament may lead to doctrinal indifference. This is surely a dubious argument. Is it conceivable that an emphasis such as Calvin placed on the sacrament could lead to disregard of doctrine? It surely did not in his case. Indeed, is not emphasis on the sacrament itself a doctrinal matter? It is when we become concerned only with the formal side of celebration that doctrine is minimized; and this article is concerned with the celebration as defined by the doctrine of the sacrament Finally, if it is true that the sacrament really imparts the life of Christ, how can the reception of Christ—the Truth—be a cause of doctrinal indifference? This objection suggests a false antithesis between doctrine and life.

How often, ideally, should we celebrate it? Ideally, we should celebrate it every week. But this ideal is faced with an imposing practical difficulty. We cannot disregard the need for an explanatory sermon. To have both sermon and sacrament each week would make the service uncomfortably long. Perhaps, as the late Prof. Volbeda used to suggest, we should have the sermon in the morning service and the communion in the evening. We are hardly ready for this. But surely we should not be wholly content with the bare minimum as we now have it.

* * *

A FINAL WORD should be said about our Form for celebration. Until now discussion of the form has been centered almost wholly on formal considerations: its length, its terminology. Another question that should at least be raised is its theological adequacy. Does the present Form do justice to the nature of the sacrament as a real means of imparting the life of Christ to us? I would suggest that the present theological emphasis of the Form is not the same as that of the creeds or of Calvin. A reading of both the Catechism and the Belgic Confession as compared with the Form for celebration shows that they are much more concerned to say that the sacrament is a real means of grace than is the Form. Only incidentally are we told in the Form that with the proper celebration of the sacrament we receive the life of Christ. Much space is given to self-examination. The commemorative aspect is emphasized. But the real participation in Christ by means of the sacrament is touched upon almost incidentally. This is a matter of emphasis, not of theological error. But in the Form for celebration emphasis is crucial. In the Form, the real nature of the sacrament should be quite clear to all.

* * *

MY REMARKS began as an answer to certain Roman Catholic criticisms of reformed theology. The answer is that Calvin, at least, believed in a real participation of Christ as fervently as any Roman Catholic, and that this is demonstrated in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is a common thing among Catholics to point to their sacrament as providing something real and to ours as provoking only a memory; theirs imparts Christ while ours elicits only a pious emotion. This is untrue, if we still hold to the doctrine of Calvin—and the creeds. But we need seriously to ask whether we are not admitting, by our own neglect, the plausibility of the Catholic argument.

18 Cf. Van Dellen and Monsma, *The Church Order Commentary*, p. 265.

Luther Was Not Alone

by LEONARD VERDUIN

COMING to the very eve of the Reformation, we find that men who taught the doctrines later to be associated with the name of Martin Luther were not at all a novelty. Schookius, a Dutch church historian of the 17th century, tells of a certain Walter Dominic who in 1510 preached the Protestant truths freely, in the vicinity of Utrecht. Accused by the local bishop, Frederick van Baden, he was apprehended. He recanted after a fashion and was set at liberty. Then, when Luther had spoken, he resumed his preaching and came to be known as "de luthersche monnik." He eluded the Inquisitor by fleeing the country. Intimate friends of his were Hoen (the Dutchman from whom Zwingli took over that doctrine of the Presence that later came to be called Zwinglianism), Cornelius Grapheus (the city clerk of Antwerp who was left to perish in a dungeon for abetting Lutheranism by re-printing Pupper van Goch's book on Christian liberty, a book already one hundred years old at the time), and Jan de Bakker (who was martyred for the faith).

So common was this sort of thing that it has been said, and correctly, that "Before Luther had given the signal there were in our country a number of clerics who had, in the midst of a general carelessness, framed a conviction for themselves which when Luther rose to be the leader was from that moment on referred to as Martinism or Lutheranism. With Protestants of this ilk the long list of martyrs begins."[7]

* * *

NOWHERE were the Augustinians so shot through with evangelical dissent as they were at Antwerp. They were in grave trouble years before Luther's name had become known; so much so that had it not been for the help of the local secular authorities and the moral assistance of the sister monastery at Enkhuyzen the very building program of the Antwerp Augustinians would have been thwarted. They did succeed in building, in 1513, only to see their whole plant liquidated and the buildings razed a decade later. Terrible anathemas were pronounced upon anyone who would ever presume to rebuild them. All the inmates, as is well known, were arrested for unorthodoxy and transported to Brussels for trial. The majority broke down and recanted; these got off with no more than an elaborate defrocking ceremony. The three who refused to repudiate their evangelical convictions were killed, one in a mysterious way in the prison, and the other two (Hendrik Voes and Johannes Esch) were burned at the stake. Luther celebrated their steadfastness in a hymn he composed for the purpose, "Ein neues Lied wir heben an." This is still sung in Lutheran churches.

What might have been the outcome had these Augustinians had the benefit of an Elector we shall leave to the imagination of the reader.

Nor was it at Antwerp only that the Augustinians were given to the evangelical position. There were some at Dordrecht also. In a letter dated March 8, 1517, the civil rulers of that city addressed a letter to the prior of the convent there complaining that four Augustinians lodged within its walls were sowing heresy in the hearts of the people, especially in connection with the confessional. The four were Peter van Ferrewairde, Cornelis van Rymerszwale, Gerryt de Man, and Symon van Mechelen, the latter a novice. Three days later the prior, William van Alcmaer, penned a reply saying that he wished to ponder the matter and promising to write again; he seems to have been quite unperturbed at the accusations levelled against the inmates of his establishment.[8]

* * *

THE CHURCH tried its best to keep the news of such happenings suppressed. But those who were in the know were thoroughly aware of these events. Staupitz was. Wrote he, in a letter to Spalatin, in 1518, "I know how the Babylonian pest, not to say the Roman pest, raves against them who speak against the abuses of those who make merchandise of Christ. Indeed, I have seen a preacher jerked violently from his pulpit as he was teaching the truth, bound with cords (although it was a festival) before the eyes of the people, and dragged to prison. There are men who have experienced even worse things."[9] We do not know specifically to what case Staupitz is referring; but we do know that at about that time more than one Augustinian was quietly shoved into a sack and dropped in the murky waters of the Schelde[10] by night.

That the church saw fit to liquidate by night is also a feature worthy of notice. This unearthly hour and this unostentatious method of putting the victims out of the way was resorted to because of the fact that the heretics enjoyed immense public support. We recall that when Voes and Esch were about to be burned the citizenry actually stormed the jail, rammed down the doors and freed another prisoner held for heresy.

In 1525 another Augustinian had his tongue cut off for being unorthodox. However, he was banished for life. An Edict was published offering a tidy sum to anyone who gave information concerning his whereabouts—he had fled the country. Any person giving the fugitive asylum, food, or encouragement was also threatened with expulsion from the land and confiscation of his goods. This Augustinian was apprehended, and he ended his days in a sack lying on the bottom of the Schelde.[11]

* * *

WE MAY get a good impression as to how much "heresy" there was among the clergy in Flanders from a perusal of a letter written by the Regent in 1525. Wrote she: "We are very well aware that the error which has risen among the common people is mostly due to the indiscrete sermons of the preachers."

Fortunately we have a lovely sample of the kind of preaching the Regent had in mind as she wrote. We have a whole volume of these "indiscrete sermons," printed in 1520, but probably prepared much earlier. They do not

7. de Wilde, *Naar de Vrijheid*, p. 8 (translation ours).

8. Documents in Fredericq's *Corpus*, Vol. IV, p. 7f.

9. The Letter is quoted by Ludwig Keller in his *Johan von Staupitz und die Anfänger der Reformation*, p. 333 (translation mine).

10. An instance is recorded in Mertens & Torfs *Geschiedenis van Antwerpen* Vol. I, p. 32ff.

11. Fredericq, *Corpus*, Vol. IV, p. 378.

m to have been Wittenberg-inspired; l they represent a theology more ture and more evangelical than any- ng Luther had as yet written. The mons we have in mind are ascribed one Nicolaas Peters, a man of whom know very little. We do know that was a monk and that he was guardian a convent. The volume has been re- duced in a recent times.[12]

Because of the fact that these ser- ns are not available everywhere and moreover in a language which not students read we shall offer a sample their contents, in translation.

* * *

THE AUTHOR begins with the as- tion that it is presently especially dful to watch and to pray "seeing t the Christian faith is at present re cruelly persecuted (wreeder ver- cht) than any crime, with fetters, , water, and gallows" (p. 8). Of ing faith he asserts that it "directs lf not to any creature, nor to St. nes, Peter, Anna, Mary, *etc.*, but to us himself who alone is a mediator ween God and us" (p. 9). Of the iever he says "He does not look to merit but simply to the truth of Word . . . putting no trust in his n faith or any other virtue, for these unable to earn salvation" (p. 16). completely has this writer broken h the theology of salvation by merit t he says, "They who think to earn Kingdom of God with their works ll be cast into the outer darkness" . 20). "Let no one fool himself by nking he will get to heaven by fast- , reading prayer books, building urches, or by any such good work, matter how high and holy he may em" (p. 47). "Good works are noth- but a testimony to our faith, wit- ssing that it is not vain and empty" . 51). Of the atoning death of *Christ* says "Through Him we must all be ved, as Peter says in Acts 3, it makes difference whether we are called ary, Peter, John, *etc.*" (p. 53). He ys that if God should wish to put a ict interpretation upon it ("als God herpelick wilde rekenen") then "all en's works are naught but sin and are ly made good by God through men's ith in Christ" (p. 54). How clean a eep this cleric has made of the in- cation to the saints may be seen from this: "The saints have not sought any other mediator in spite of the fact that many saints had preceeded them to heaven" (p. 55). He complains that the "make-believe saints" (schynende heylighe) are wholly averse to this doctrine; he adds triumphantly "Why go to someone else seeing that He is more gracious than all His saints!" (p. 55). Of the heart of the believer he says that "when Christ has entered in He begins to reign there and to cast out the popish barter (die papistelicke marct) — I refer to those who offer to sell their own good works to others" (p. 56). He champions lay-preaching in these terms, as he refers to the children crying hosannah and the Jewish leaders seeking to silence them: "Similarly the great and learned ones and the holy ones of this world are offended because the Gospel of the good news is being preached by plain and unlettered men, some crying out 'This unlearned fool presumes to read the Holy Scriptures and the Gospel' while others declare 'they don't understand it,' as still others hiss between their teeth 'O. K, if they want to read it but let them shut their mouths and keep it to themselves'" (p. 58). Similarly at another place, he says, as he comments on the words 'Is not this Joseph's son?' "When they hear a plain man or a poor person announce the glad tidings they say 'How can that fellow teach, not having been taught? He is a cobbler's son, he doesn't have a Master's degree or a Doctor's—' as if the Holy Spirit were unwilling to teach those whom the world disdains, ah no, those he teaches by preference and these are they whom he elects" (p. 166).

* * *

THE AUTHOR of these Sermons knows that persecution awaits him who speaks thus: "they who teach this correctly must not think they will be able to do so without persecution and suffering" (p. 59).

And notice this advanced doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit: "The Word without the inworking of the Spirit does not make the sinful conscience whole; for even though it is a Word spoken or written by the Holy Spirit it does not become spirit in the reader or the hearer, that is, it does not give him love to see it through—unless the Holy Spirit stirs that heart and works in the man who hears or reads. And so it is not enough for God once to have spoken the Word, He must ever make it to come alive in those who hear or read" (p. 76). Speaking again of prayer to the saints he says "How unthankful, sinful, and unworthy, to seek other advocates, even if they be His apostles!" and he advises "to go straight to Christ (maer terstont sonder middel tot Christum selve roepen) seeing that He is more merciful than all His saints" (p. 91). Unequivocally he espouses the idea of *sola Scriptura*, saying "Where God's Word has not come faith is impossible" (p. 100). Could anyone express himself more evangelically than does our author "For we are all made of the very same dough of which harlots and knaves are made; that we stand is due to God's grace alone. If this were not so our righteousness would hang on a blade of grass and would easily give way" (p. 114). Suffering and poverty "make no man acceptable with God except in the case of him who is already well-pleasing to God through faith . . . his poverty and suffering are precious in the sight of God" (p. 129). Of the church's excommunication he says "No one has the power to expel except with the consent of the Christian assembly; if the aforesaid manner of admonition and expulsion were observed it would do more good than all the anathemas of Antichrist's realm" (p. 177). Of the Catholic clergy of his day he says "Well has the prophet Isaiah foretold of you, hypocrites, saying 'This people honors me with their lips, they read and mumble aplenty and have God on their tongue incessantly—but their heart, it is far from me'!" (p. 183)

Whoever Nicolaas Peters may have been, it is patent that Wittenberg had not made him what he was. He acknowledges no such debt and the date of publication is too early for that. The man has come completely clear of all that is characteristic of the Catholic system; one finds no trace (as with Luther for many years yet to come) of the old leaven still operating in his mind.

* * *

SO COMMON were the evangelical ideas in Flanders in the early 16th century and so generally were they associated with the "heretical" Augustinians that we hear people ask each

. A discussion of the author of these ser- ons occurred in *Boekzaal der Geleerde Wer- ld* of 1857.

Luther Was Not Alone — Continued

other on the streets of Antwerp in 1526, "*Wat geloove hebde ghy, Predickheren oft Augustyns geloove?*" (What kind of faith is your faith, that of the Dominicans or that of the Augustinians? And the significant thing is that they said this as they stood about the scaffold upon which nine persons were exhibited, both men and women, accused of holding to "Lutheran" doctrines. For the common people the ideas of these people did not trace back to Wittenberg, this was simply "Augustyns geloove"![13]

13. From a contemporary chronicle, printed by Piot in *Chroniques de Brabant et de Flandre*, p. 92f.

Foreign Languages for the Christian School Child

by CLARENCE BOERSMA*

LANGUAGE skill stands out as one of the principal gifts of God to all men — and exclusively to men. Man is created in the image of Him who *spoke* and the heavens and earth were created; who *spoke* "to us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things"; and who *spoke* to prophets and apostles, whereby "every Scripture is inspired by God and is profitable for teaching" etc. We are both created and redeemed by God's Almighty Word. Because of the God-like qualities which the Creator built into the nature of man, the alert Christian will sense the compelling importance of the *human* word. This is the tool whereby we all exercise to some degree our distinctly human office of prophet. This is the God-like instrument with which men shape their most illumined creations. With this the finite image-bearer of God can participate in human redemption — whether on the level of Common Grace or of Special Grace.

* * *

MAN'S INBORN TALANT for language is especially evident in the variety of languages. The multiplicity of languages is not, as is too commonly supposed, a punishment meted out to men in general because certain of them proudly built the tower of Babel. Only the original sin of Adam and Eve brought the earth and mankind at once under a general curse. God does not, in addition, impute the sins of these primitive tower builders on the rest of humankind. To be sure, God frustrated these proud architects who put their trust in brick and slime and who, defying Jehovah's orders to subdue the earth, proposed a tower — "lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." But their frustration was a blessing to mankind, not a curse. Now, as a result of the confusion of tongues, the cultural mandate could be carried out. Indeed there is no reason to believe that before the Deluge everyone spoke the same language. Nor is there any evidence in Scripture that the existence of many languages is *per se* unideal. It is safe to assume that God *wanted* diversity of languages as well as dispersion of men throughout the earth. Languages are merely another evidence of the principle of unity and diversity in God's Creation. It is interesting that in the first book of the Bible we read of Jehovah scattering abroad the proud men seeking to "make a name for themselves" in the plain of Shinar — and that we read repeatedly in the last book of the Bible of the successful culmination of Jehovah's cosmic program of salvation when we read of the redeemed "of every tribe and tongue, and people and nation." Redemption's story is too great to be expressed in only one set of symbols — "one language and one speech." Each language utilizes its own particular genius to bring new glory to "Him that sitteth upon the throne."

Goethe said that he wished each of his works — large or small — to be looked upon as a fragment of one great confession. That is the essence of all worthy literature — confession — or if you will, revelation, prophecy. Just as God is a revealing God, so man made in His image, is a revealing, communicating man. Since no two languages communicate identically, the diversity of languages appears as a divinely ordained means for completing the total human self-revelation. Therefore, wherever and whenever man — Christian or pagan — reveals some after glow of the divine radiance with which he was created, wherever and whenever men reveal new insights into the essential character of this image bearer of God, it is our duty to pay attention — to listen and learn.

* * *

CONTEMPORARY American mass education ignores this problem of the nature of man and his relationship to God. Therefore in our country's schools man's *value* is left unexplored and the millions that crowd our classrooms are given no inkling of their heritage as sons of God. The proper study of man is no longer man — not even in the sense that Pope meant it, much less in a specifically Christian context. In contemporary education the proper study of man is his environment. All America goes to school to find an answer to this question: "How can I so outwit my environment as to enjoy survival?" All interest in the ageless and tormenting questions of whence? why? and whither? are forgotten in the happier pursuit of a *modus vivendi* called economic security or success. Surely this is education "whose end is perdition, whose god is the belly, and whose glory is in shame."

Let no one say that our Christian schools have not suffered from the temper of our times. There is with us, too, an impatience about *knowing* in our haste to *know how*. The aim of Christian education, too, is gradually being dissociated from the idea of initiating our students into the *contemplative* life. Preparation for the *active* life, with its requirement of professional and technical skills, is taking on ever-increasing importance when we consider the goals of education. Mr. Vander Smith sends his boy to Calvin College "to become

* Dr. Boersma is associate professor of German at Calvin College.

ntist." Happily, this college, through ristian instruction in the liberal arts, more interested in Mr. Vander Smith, ., as man — as redeemed man — than dentist.

If and when the emphasis in the wer schools is upon the narrowly ractical, students come to college inlequately trained in such disciplines Mathematics, Rhetoric, and Lanuages. Instead of mathematics, they ay come with machine shop credits nd instead of Cicero, a course in safe riving.

If college is to be a place where the udent is confronted with his intellecal and spiritual heritage and is exected to submit himself to its molding nfluence, then it is obvious that whatver time is spent in college to train im in the language skills necessary for omprehending that heritage is a loss. is a phenomenon these days if a litary senior can read *both* Moliere and oethe, whereas the rule should be that e comes as a Freshman ready to read ese masters. Whatever contact the verage student gains with non-English assics is therefore necessarily spotty, perficial, second-hand, or nil. And is is symptomatic of the respect paid the study of human values. The stuent must be content to study the spirual structure of God's image bearer nly where this happens to be revealed modern English.

The United States is recognized roughout the world for its leaderhip. But it must never be forgotten at this leadership is limited to the chnological, to the *know how* of conolling our environment. To the quesion "how?" Yankee ingenuity readily nswers, "Can do," — but to the quesion "why?" one too often hears the nswer, "So what?" Whatever intelectual and spiritual leadership there as been in our Occidental world has argely come from Europe. We must naintain thorough, critical contact with st and, if possible, exert spiritual leadrship. Our nation must grow spiritually and morally if our clever bombs re not to burst in our faces. Spiritual nd intellectual maturity is our greatst need. There is hardly a greater ervice that Christians could render heir country than the exercise of their edeemed minds in the evaluation, critiism of, and contribution to the Occiental (European) attempts to meet ife's fundamental problems.

* * *

IF THE AMERICAN student's linguistic handicap is to be overcome, he should have an opportunity to begin foreign language study at an earlier age, and the age I suggest here is the preadolescent, grade-school age. Everyone agrees that this is the ideal time to introduce young people to the understanding and use of a foreign language. In the fourth, fifth and sixth grades, let us say, the youngster is intrigued by the mystery of a foreign tongue and is eager to be initiated into the circle of those who understand and use these strange symbols. Witness, for instance, the persistence, generation after generation, of "pig-latin" among children of this age group. At this stage the child shows remarkable ability to imitate. His vocal organs are still supple and educable so that a high degree of excellence in pronunciation can be attained. At this age there is as yet no sign of that miserable self-consciousness that frustrates the linguistic attempts of the mature person. Nor is there yet the silliness and superciliousness of the early adolescent which plagues the high-school language teacher.

Although the opinion that childhood is the most favorable period for learning a foreign language has been held universally for a long time, it is not until recently that an outstanding neurologist has suggested an anatomical and physiological basis for the comparative ease with which children learn foreign languages. Dr. Wilder Penfield, Director of the Montreal Neurological Institute, early this year read a paper before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences the main point of which we quote: "There is an age when the child has a remarkable capacity to utilize these areas [of the cerebral cortex] for the learning of language, a time when several languages can be learned simultaneously as easily as one language. Later, with the appearance of capacity for reason and for abstract thinking, this early ability is largely lost. One who is mindful of the changing physiology of the human brain might marvel at educational curricula. Why should foreign languages (dead or alive) make their first appearance long after a boy or girl has lost full capacity for language learning?"

Europeans recognize the value of early introduction to foreign languages. A number of Swedish schools begin the study of English at 11, German at 13, and French at 14. In France the pupil is introduced to his first foreign language at 11. In Italy, at 12, in Egypt at 9, and in Lebanon, at 6 years. In America, however, it is not infrequent that the Ph.D. candidate has successfully completed his comprehensive examinations, and has his dissertation approved and bound, but must still undergo the tormenting discipline required to read 350 words of German and/or French per hour with the aid of a dictionary.

* * *

SERIOUS STUDY of foreign languages during childhood and continued in secondary schools, is essential for the integration of the individual with his cultural and religious heritage. John J. McCloy, recently United States High Commissioner for Germany, emphasized this in a Convocation address at Washington College, Chestertown, Pa. He told of a conversation with a German exchange student whose parents he had known well in Germany. They drifted into a discussion of the *Gymnasium* course from which the young German had graduated. At this point let me quote from Mr. McCloy's speech:

> "I asked him what his studies had been in Germany. They were the usual group: Latin, Greek, Mathematics, German Literature, French, Physics, Chemistry and Biology. I asked him how far he had gone in Greek. He replied he had read Homer, the Dramatists, Plato, the Greek Gospels and other more obscure sources. . . . His Latin was at a similar stage. He had had differential calculus and analytical geometry. Now, this young man was not studying to be a university professor or to become a minister of the gospel . . . He was studying to be a forester. And, of course, while he was talking to me, he was speaking very good English."

Mr. McCloy's point in relating this was to show that the United States cannot hope to give genuine world-leadership — the competition from foreign schools is too great — unless a greater percentage of its citizens have a thorough understanding of their cultural roots — and an intimate knowledge of these roots is impossible to those who have not learned to read foreign lan-

guages. Let me quote one more paragraph from Mr. McCloy:

> "In passing, may I be so bold as to say that, generally speaking, the method of teaching foreign languages in this country is, to my mind, atrocious. How many of us can speak or read with any real facility in spite of the long hours of translation and prose exercises which plagued most of our ancient and modern language courses. I would agree with those who say that there is no use in continuing these courses if they involve only these unproductive drills. But I agree most fervently with those educators who feel that it is essential that a knowledge and appreciation of the thought and culture upon which our Western civilization rests be given to our students."

* * *

HAS ANYTHING been done in this country to alter this situation? I am happy to report not only that some noble experiments have been made in this direction, but also that current interest in foreign language study on the grade school level shows a sharp rise, and that a boom in grade school language teaching may be in the offing. The moving spirit behind this new wind in American education is Dr. Earl McGrath, formerly United States Commissioner of Education. A year ago last May he requested to be allowed to address the 35th Annual Meeting of the Central States Modern Language Teachers Association at St. Louis. He asked to speak there in spite of the fact that in his three years in office, he had had some 1500 invitations to speak elsewhere — most of which, naturally, he had to decline. His address "Language Study and World Affairs" was an urgent appeal to American educators to recognize that America's global responsibility toward freedom loving peoples is hampered seriously by our lack of understanding and appreciation for foreign languages and foreign cultures.

Under Dr. McGrath's leadership the United States Office of Education called a Conference on the Role of Foreign Languages in American Schools. This Conference was held in January of last year, in Washington, D.C. It dealt exclusively with foreign languages in the elementary school. It concerned itself with many aspects of the subject: aims and objectives, methods, administrative and curriculum problems, problems of proper teacher education, etc.

To be sure, one suspects Dr. McGrath and the leaders in this movement of being too much interested in the immediate problem of making friends and influencing people globally—and incidentally of interesting them in our better mousetrap: electronic, chlorophyll-deodorized, with automatic ejector — than in the contributions that these cultures have made to the sum-total of human self-revelation. Nevertheless, there is an up-surge of interest in grade-school foreign language study because of the international prestige of the United States. From this will come certain experience from which we can profit. Related to this new enthusiasm, it seems, is the recent generous grant by the Rockefeller Foundation to the Modern Language Association of America for a three-year inquiry into language teaching in America.

* * *

WHAT IS the status of Modern Language teaching on the Grade School level in America today? The total effort may surprise you.

In Cleveland a program providing opportunity for learning French in the grades has been in operation since 1921. Specially certified teachers, trained at Western Reserve University are available for this work. The Cleveland course of study is widely used as a guide for other schools wishing to introduce foreign language study. About a thousand children or more, chosen on an I.Q. basis profit from this instruction. In Washington, D.C. some 22 thousand children, white and colored, are receiving regular instruction in French, German, Latin, or Spanish. In the more or less bilingual areas of our country foreign language study is particularly popular in the grades: Spanish in the Southwest and French in New England and Louisiana. All Los Angeles school children receive instruction in Spanish in all elementary grades.

Only last month the Modern Language Association of America reported the following:

> "In the fall of 1953 modern foreign languages were being taught in the elementary schools of at least 145 American cities and towns in 33 states and the District of Columbia. Grade school children were learning Spanish in at least 409 schools in 27 states; French, in 251 schools in 20 states; German, in 30 schools in 6 states; and Italian was being taught in one school in Atlantic City, New Jersey. All told, at least 145,000 children were involved in the programs recorded. In all cases these are minimum figures, for the survey was limited to reliable data.
>
> The facts show that this movement has developed only recently and is expanding at a rapid pace. Of the 155 programs recorded in 145 communities, only 28 were in existence in 1948. Ten more were begun in 1949, ten in 1950, and nine in 1951. In 1952 thirty-two more programs were started, and in 1953 at least sixty-six new programs got under way."

Parental support and co-operation for the foreign language program is well nigh universal. When in 1937, a French program was initiated in the sixth and seventh grades of four schools in a bi-lingual area of Louisiana, it was largely through the pressure of non-French parents that the movement spread throughout the state. In 1939, 200 teachers were teaching French in Louisiana elementary schools with over 6000 pupils receiving instruction. Teacher training for elementary language teaching was made available at the State University, a syllabus on elementary-school French was prepared, and the program was extended to all the public elementary schools of the state. When Dr. McGrath's lecture to the Modern Language teachers was published, he received over a thousand replies — only one of which was unfavorable toward the program he proposed. In the words of Emilie Margaret White, supervisor of the foreign language work in the District of Columbia, the response in her city and throughout the land "would seem to indicate that the public is ahead of curriculum makers in general in their awareness of the need for a great many individuals to know at least one language other than their own."

* * *

THERE ARE many problems to be solved before our Christian Schools can begin teaching foreign languages. There must be some degree of unanimity as to aims, there must be adequate teacher training. There must be assurance that

e child who has begun his language arning in the grades, can continue s work in Junior High School and Senior High School. The problem is to whether foreign language study the grades is to fit into an enrichment rogram for the unusually gifted — or is to be for all students — must be faced. There will be differences of opinions as to the relative value of the foreign languages that could be taught.

It is to be hoped that our schools will come to recognize foreign language study as a part of the thorough furnishing of the man of God unto every good work. They will then consider this challenging work soberly, accept it prayerfully, make haste slowly in preparing the program, and ultimately, by effective language teaching, fortify the Kingdom of God.

Solomon Froeligh, D. D.

by WILLIAM C. KIESSEL, JR.*

IN THE CEMETERY of the Old outh Church in Bergenfield, New Jerey, close to the sanctuary he served for orty-one years, lies Solomon Froeligh, ounder of the True Dutch Reformed hurch, and one of the controversial eligious figures in American history.

Solomon Froeligh was born at Red ook in Dutchess County, New York, n May 29, 1750, the oldest son of poor arming people. At the age of fourteen e came under the influence of Domie Johannes Schuneman and soon afr felt a definite call to the ministry. oung Solomon's saintly mother saw to it that her son was instructed in the arsonage school of the Rev. Dirck omeyn.

For three years Froeligh lived with he Romeyn family, moving along to Hackensack, New Jersey, when Romeyn as transferred there. Subsequently he nrolled in the Academy directed by eter Wilson and, after completion of is studies in the classics, he went with he Rev. John Henry Goetschius. After hree years of theological training under the learned Goetschius, who had been educated in Zurich, Froeligh was eady for his examinations.

In October, 1774, Froeligh was exmined for licensure before the Genral Convention of Ministers and Elders by Drs. Johannes Leydt, Jacob R. Hardenbergh, and John H. Livingstone and showing a suitable proficiency, was licensed to preach. His Ordination Sermon was preached by the Rev. Lambertus de Ronde of the Collegiate Church in New York City. That same year, Froeligh was awarded a Master of Arts degree by President John Witherspoon at The College of New Jersey at Princeton.

* * *

ON JUNE 11, 1775, Froeligh was appointed pastor of four Dutch congregations: Jamaica, Newtown, Oyster Bay, and Success on Long Island, to succeed the Rev. Hermanus L. Boelen, a noted Tory. Froeligh served this circuit for fifteen months, until the capture of Long Island by the British in September, 1776. Because of his ardent patriotism, Froeligh was forced to flee, losing all his worldly possessions, including a very fine library. The church edifice in Jamaica was converted into a storehouse for goods and provisions by the British.

Froeligh fled with his wife and growing family — he had married Rachel Vanderbeck of Hackensack on November 11, 1771 — to the home of Dr. Laidle in Hackensack. He was then appointed Chaplain of the First New York Line, Third Continental Establishment, which appointment was approved on November 21, 1776, reconfirmed on January 3, 1777, and finally dropped the following September.

The next pastoral charge of Froeligh was along the west side of the Hudson River in the vicinity of Fishkill and Poughkeepsie, where he traveled on horseback to preach at his several churches and visit with his scattered parishioners. After three years Froeligh was called to the united congregations of Millstone (Hillsborough) and Ne-shanick in Somerset County, New Jersey.

Froeligh began his work in Millstone in 1780, and, shortly after his arrival he had a glorious revival. It was while serving in Somerset County that Froeligh became closely connected with Queens College or Rutgers University, as we know it today. In 1782 Froeligh was appointed to the faculty with a salary of six pounds for each student tutored. The following year he was elected a trustee and at the commencement that year awarded degrees to the four candidates as president pro tem of Queens College.

During this period Froeligh evidently had some tenuous connection with Hackensack and Schraalenburgh (Bergenfield) as the church records reveal marriages performed by him as early as February 21, 1784. On September 14, 1786 Froeligh was formally invited to Hackensack as pastor over the Hackensack (First) Church and the Schraalenburgh (First) Consistories to succeed Romeyn, who had transferred to Schenectady where he was later instrumental in founding Union College.

In 1786 there were two Reformed Dutch Churches in Hackensack each with its own consistory but united under one corporation. Froeligh was called by the Classis to preside over the church organized by the Rev. Peter Taschemaker in 1686. The second church, organized in 1756 was presided over, in 1786, by Rev. Walmoldus Kuypers. The church in Schraalenburgh had been organized in 1724 and the building erected the following year, with Rev. Reinhardt Erickson as the first minister.

The struggle of the Reformed Dutch Church for ecclesiastical independence from Holland, beginning with the Rev. Theodorus J. Frelinghuysen in 1720 through the conflicting Coetus and Conferentie parties until final emancipation and establishment of an independent American Reformed Church in 1792, is an interesting study but it is unnecessary to discuss it here.

* * *

THE CLASSIS of Hackensack was one of the hotbeds of dissention between the Coetus and Conferentie followers. Solomon Froeligh was the leader of the Coetus or progressive party advocating independence while Kuypers was pastor to the Conferentia consistory which advocated continued allegiance to Holland. The two parties, united under one corporation, also had been divided by opposite sentiments in the Revolutionary struggle and the early political controversies of the country.

* Mr. Kiessel, of Bergenfield, New Jersey, is a student of American History, and a member of the Editorial Research Staff of the Grolier Publishing Company.

Solomon Froeligh — Continued

Froeligh, with the encouragement of the Synod and the cooperation of his consistory made every effort to heal the breach and reconcile the two parties. Finally, in 1789, peace was achieved and the opposing elements worshipped together and even built a church in common but the strife soon burst forth anew.

On July 10, 1795 the union church was struck by lightning and the stone set over the entrance bearing the inscription "Een Dracht Maakt Macht" (Union Makes Strength) was broken in two. This was looked upon as ominous and the following Sunday Froeligh preached on "God's Marvellous Thunder," and from then on all efforts for harmony failed.

Rev. Kuypers died on September 10, 1797 and was replaced by the Rev. James V. C. Romeyn. His consistory politely invited Froeligh to officiate at his installation, but he declined. Realizing the state of affairs and anxious to prevent further collision the Synod in 1800 finally declared Froeligh's church to belong to the Classis of Paramus and Romeyn's to the Classis of Bergen. But this was only a temporary armistice.

* * *

DURING this period Froeligh continued his connections with Queens College and the Seminary of the Reformed Church. He was appointed Lector of Hebrew for the seminary in 1792, succeeding Dr. Hermanus Mayer of Pompton Plains, and to full Professor of Didactic Theology in 1797 at an honorarium of ten pounds for each student taught. In his career Froeligh trained approximately thirty men for the ministry including his brother Moses, his own son Peter Ditmars, his son-in-law Ralph A. Westervelt, and many others who became leaders in the church.

In those days each student was taught natural, didactic, polemic and practical theology; Biblical criticism; chronology and ecclesiastical history; the form and administration of church government and pastoral duties; and the ability to read the Holy Scripture fluently in the original Greek and Hebrew. A sermon was prepared each week on a topic assigned to the student. At the end of three years the candidate submitted to an examination for a professorial certificate upon which testimony he was admitted to examination for licensure.

Froeligh must have been a man of tremendous vitality because with all his activities he was also a soul-saving proclaimer of the Gospel message. In March, 1800 he preached on Psalm 76 with such inspiration that a revival began which lasted nine months, swept all New Jersey and increased the congregation of the Schraalenburgh Church by over two hundred souls. Froeligh was not a man of lofty genius or intellectual greatness, but a consecrated man of grace and prayer who followed the track of doctrinal exposition and experimental religion.

* * *

CHURCH-GOING at that time in the farming communities was an all day affair. Lunches were packed early on Sunday morning, chairs taken along to sit on, and the families piled into the wagons to arrive at the centrally located church in time for the service which began at 10 o'clock. The sermon, in Dutch, was on sanctification and was long and expository, with the accompanying prayers fervent and loud. There was a realization of sin and the need for the saving power of Jesus Christ. At 12 o'clock the sermon ended, the members gathered under the trees and broke bread together, the horses were fed, and then at 1 o'clock the worshippers gathered once again for the spiritual manna according to the Order of the Heidelberg Catechism. At 4 o'clock the afternoon service was over.

* * *

BY 1811 the Schraalenburgh Church under Rev. Froeligh had a congregation of 117 families and 459 souls while the church at Hackensack had 100 families and 372 communicant members. That same year the efforts of Froeligh were recognized when he was granted an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree. However, as Froeligh grew older he began to have doctrinal differences with the Classis. He accused the church of being Hopkinsian or too mildly Calvinistic.

The temporary peace which had been established by creating the two separate Classes of Hackensack and Paramus suffered a set-back in 1818 when Froeligh accepted into his consistory two persons who had not been officially relieved from Rev. Romeyn's church. Charges of being disorderly and unconstitutional were leveled against Froeligh, thus widening the breach. Conditions further deteriorated when Froeligh continued to receive suspended members of Romeyn's congregations.

Finally, in October, 1822, after several meetings at the homes of James Forrester and Jacobus Brinckerhoff and soul-searching days and nights in fasting and prayer, Froeligh felt led to secede from the established church. On Tuesday, October 22, 1822 at the home of Cornelius Terhune, Dr. Froeligh with Abram Brokaw, Sylvanus Palmer, John C. Toll, and Henry V. Wyckoff representing seven congregations, organized what was called The True Reformed Dutch Church. Froeligh was immediately suspended from his faculty positions at Queens College and the Seminary. The Synod also instigated legal action over the property of the churches involved, but this came to nothing.

The reasons advanced by Froeligh and his followers for seceding were "laxness in discipling offending members, indiscriminate abuse of sealing ordinance, toleration of Hopkinsian, and Arminian teachings on the atonement." Froeligh further maintained that he was not separating from the old denomination, but rather remained the identical Reformed Dutch Church adopting all the doctrines and standards established and ratified in the Synod of Dort in 1618.

A Classis was formed and in June and July of 1823 and 1824 meetings were held at Danube and Watervliet, New York, where a General Synod was organized with Solomon Froeligh as president. Two Classes were formed; that of Hackensack and of Union, in Central New York State. By April 21, 1825 The True Reformed Dutch Church had increased to twelve ministers and twenty congregations. The first candidate licensed by the General Synod was Stephen Z. Goetschius, the grandson of the Rev. John Henry Goetschius, who had been Froeligh's preceptor in theology decades earlier. By 1826 the number of congregations had increased to twenty-six.

However, by this time Froeligh was an old man weighted down by more than the Biblical three score and ten years, burdened with the souls of his flock, and worn out by years of traveling by horseback over the rough roads in New Jersey and New York as he

eached, taught, and attended meet-gs. When it was suggested he rest om his labors, Froeligh replied he ould rather "wear out than rust away." e preached his last sermon at Schraal-burgh Church on August 5, 1827. n Monday afternoon the following ctober 8th, the Rev. Solomon Froe-h walked with God. His successor the South Church was the Rev. Cor-lius J. Blauvelt who introduced Eng-h services for the first time and who rved until 1852.

* * *

THE LEADERSHIP of The True tch Reformed Church passed to Cor-lius T. Demarest, pastor of the Eng-h Neighborhood (Leonia) Church, a former student of Froeligh's in 1807, who had become one of his most ardent disciples. By 1830 The True Reformed Dutch Church had increased to ten ministers and thirty congregations, but without the guiding spirit of Froeligh the movement began to lose momentum. As the original ministers retired or died there were few to take their places. By 1860 the congregations had decreased to sixteen with a proportionate loss in membership.

Several of the congregations rejoined the Reformed Church, others the Presbyterian similarly Calvinistic in doctrine and constitution. In 1890 the feeble remnant, consisting of thirteen congregations of 507 families and 2000 souls, united with the Christian Reformed Church which had been formed in Michigan in 1857 by the Rev. K. Vanden Bosch. However, the congregations of the English Neighborhood Church, of which Peter Froeligh had once been pastor, and Solomon Froeligh's Old South Church in Schraalenburgh, preferred to eventually unite with the Presbyterian Church.

And so an interesting episode in American church history was brought to a close. And in the cemetery of the Old South Church in what is now Bergenfield stands an almost neglected tombstone on which is inscribed, "Solomon Froeligh . . . A faithful servant of Jesus Christ. In labours abundant, in success great. And mighty only through God. The world was his enemy, Saints his friends."

Bible Teaching in the Schools

by NICHOLAS H. BEVERSLUIS*

THE QUESTION of Bible teaching the schools is an urgent one. For ars National Union committees, area school committees, and teachers in e classroom have puzzled over it. eriodically the schools are criticized r doing less, or other, than they ould. Regarding matters of content d objectives, high school Bible teach-s from east to west have been un-greed, at times basically. The ques-on will this summer be highlighted as e central theme of the annual Chris-an School Principals' Conference, onsored by the National Union and alvin College.

There are many parts to the ques-on, but the basic ones, I think, are ese: Shall the schools, as schools, pro-ide a unique kind of Bible teaching? so, What kind shall it be? An af-rmative answer and a general accept-nce of what the role of the schools is ill, I think, do two things: 1) elimi-ate the deplorable overlapping and uplication which now occur in the ible teaching of Sunday School, Cate-hism class, Christian home, and Chris-an school; 2) inject into and guar-ntee for our total Bible teaching a cer-ain kind of Bible study, without which iblical illiteracy among us will con-nue and get worse.

SHOULD the school have its own kind of Bible teaching? I think it should. Take Miss Smith in the fifth grade. She is a good teacher. She teaches good geography and good arithmetic and everything else. But what of Bible? If in the Bible period she 1) merely tells the indicated story, or 2) repeats last Sunday's Sunday school lesson or last Tuesday's catechism lesson, or 3) duplicates what was emphasized at last night's family devotions — if that constitutes the Bible lesson for the fifth grade, she will be teaching Bible poorly. If, however, she does as well as she does in her other subjects, she 1) will make of the lesson in part (depending on the story) a lesson in Bible geography or 2) Bible history, or 3) Bible customs and culture. That is, she will be teaching Bible as a formal, an academic school subject.

The point is not, then, whether what Miss Smith does is valuable or not, but whether 1) she is needlessly duplicating what others can do (and likely, in the control of the church or home, even better than she) and 2) she is taking full advantage of an opportunity to do what she has more time, superior facilities, better warrant to do. I suggest, therefore, that School Bible teaching will be different from that of home and church as these institutions themselves differ. While the educational task of these three is at bottom one task, and while some overlapping in the Bible teaching done by them will continue, a working distinction among them can and should be observed. Each of these in our Christian society has its own important educational responsibility toward the child. Each is uniquely equipped to do its particular work. For these reasons none of the three may lightly give any of its assigned task to either of the others. And because each is hard pressed to accomplish its own task, none may lightly take on additional assignment from either of the others. (This is a useful principle, I think, for areas other than Bible. We should not, e.g., be too ready to adopt the "curriculum enrichment" programs of public education. Public schools are forced here and there to pick up after the neglect of home and church. Among us the home is still the home, or is at least bound by a common Christian conscience to be such. And the church is still the church. Therefore the school is free to be the school.)

This responsibility and opportunity should find the schools functioning as schools. Making all due allowances for the changes demanded by mass education, better pedagogical insights, changing environment, and so on, it remains that 1) schools are the agents of formal, liberal, total, humane education,

---

* Rev. Beversluis is principal of Eastern Academy, Paterson, New Jersey.

Bible Teaching in the Schools — Continued

2) that it is such education that neither home nor church can supply, and 3) that it is such education which every child needs as human, as image bearer, as rational-moral personality.

The Bible teaching in the schools must then be of a piece with this total educational task. Just as in our schools the general educational task is not secular but religious, so the Bible courses are not uniquely religious but educational. Just as our homes and churches do not provide general education, so they do not provide formal academic courses in Bible.

THE BIBLE TEACHING in the schools, then, should be formal, liberal, academic. This means that at least the following objectives should be aimed at: 1) knowledge-objectives, involving Scriptural facts of all kinds; 2) skill-objectives, involving the use of this knowledge as well as of the Bible itself; 3) system-objectives, involving the scope and pattern and organization of Scripture. It means that increasingly, according to each learning level of the child, he be brought to know the Bible concretely — in its geographical and cultural context, within its historical bounds, through its living human authors, under its revelational imprint. It means that story will not be piled upon story, year after year, as ends in themselves or merely as vehicles for moral lessons. It means rather that stories will become history and history, revelation. But then the people (the outstanding ones), and the events (outstanding ones), and dates (outstanding ones, in round figures) will have to be fixed firmly in mind. These in turn must become the living history of Scripture. Out of that history in turn must appear the heart and mind of divine revelation. The latter is, of course, the main business of the teaching, but it will never get through to the pupil, certainly he will never become intimate with it, in school now, or in church, unless he first have in hand the raw data of the Scripture. Without this factual, formal framework, many adults have remained adolescents in the O. T. wilderness, zealous for preserving a Bible of 66 books, but leaving it largely unread and/or not understood.

Bible teaching in the schools, then, is not the school's evangelistic or devotional medium. Objectives are not conversion or piety as such, but a foundational knowledge of what there is to know. Of course, a Christian teacher will never be indifferent to the child's deepest religious experiences and needs. Such a teacher will never neglect an opportunity to direct a moral and religious challenge. This is true always in a Christian classroom, but especially when Bible is taught. It cannot be otherwise. Yet unless Bible study be essentially as much a formal, academic discipline as geography and English and arithmetic it will be poorly taught. And this in a Christian school would be immoral.

* * *

FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL there are special problems. On this level there is not, as there is for the elementary, a National Union recommended course of study. It presents problems of its own therefore, since the *what* of Bible teaching must in a special way be faced. Shall there be a study of one or another Bible book? or the life of Christ? or of Paul? And shall there be a course in Christian apologetics? and in Christian conduct? And what of Church History and Reformed doctrine?

Suppose one of the areas selected is that of Christian ethics. Such a course should then be practical and relevant; but if it is to be more than a Sunday School or a young men's society type of study — if it is to be a school subject, it should above all be a foundational course. By this I understand that it should be formal, systematic, in the sense that the universals of the moral law take precedence over the particulars of twentieth century behavior problems. The Bible should be read, be heard, be understood. This means lessons in Bible reading as well as in elementary Bible exegesis. It means gathering the Biblical data, reaching tentative conclusions, testing the conclusions, accepting the valid ones, rejecting the others. It means dealing seriously with Scripture in order to know at first hand the moral law of God. Such a course, because it will have sweep and scope, will have as much of social as individual emphasis; it will likely disturb more than it soothes; and so far from being merely a series of problem-solving exercises, it should uncover as many problems as it settles. Such formal study of Scripture will seek to free the pupil from both legalism and self-righteousness.

* * *

A WORD, too, about Reformed Doctrine. There is some disagreement regarding its inclusion in a high school curriculum. This, it could be said, is a clear case of the school encroaching upon the church. I hold that such a course can be a very proper school course. Even if high school seniors were satisfactorily informed on Christian doctrine, which they are not, the case for its inclusion could, I think, be made. But then it must be said at once that the structure, the content, the objectives and the disciplines of such a course would differ from, say, the catechism instruction given perhaps simultaneously to the same students. In fact, the point made in this paper throughout regarding the formal and liberal character of school Bible teaching as compared with that of the church, may here be best illustrated. That is to say, the doctrine instruction in the church is mainly a confessional matter. Leading immediately up to public profession of faith or not, it is a personalized, experiential, existenial matter. The text is the Heidelberg catechism. "What is *your* only comfort?" What do you believe . . .? What is your commitment? What is your status as regards your baptism, your life, your eternal destiny? What does the body of Christian truth mean to you? And so on. It is the administration of the Word, doctrinally, educationally, to those who are not yet sheep in the fold but who soon will be.

A school course in doctrine is different. Its concern too is moral and personal, like that of the church, but its course in doctrine does not, as does the church's, take its rise out of that particular concern. Its aim is formal, liberal education in the system of Christianity. It seeks to set forth the Christian system, the Christian philosophy, positively. It aims at the universals, the pattern, the totality of truth. Next to that, it sets this truth up over against its opposites and also compares with it those Christian systems which are inferior to it. That is to say, not the Heidelberg Catechism approach to doctrine but the Belgic Confession approach is taken, with the orderly divisions of

stematic theology providing one of e patterns. So too, beyond the stunt's personal identification with this uth, the social and kingdom implicans of this truth are stressed. Someng of Calvinism, therefore, as a lifeew will be part of it. As such, a urse in Christian doctrine has a necsary place in the schools, and will ve well to fill out the formal educan of high school seniors.

* * *

IN THE FOREGOING I have been guing that the Bible teaching in our hools ought to be of a special kind, mely, formal, academic Bible teachg, of a piece with the school's educan generally. I should like in conusion to show that I am in good comny when I emphasize this. The Nanal Union *Course of Study*, in its tement regarding the objectives of ble study in the schools, suggests that e Christian school is to be a cooperng agent along with 1) the Christian me, which will lay the basis of Chrisn character and continue to nourish 2) the church's catechism class which ll indoctrinate the child or young rson — that is, teach him the church's rticular interpretation of Scripture; d 3) the Sunday School which serves stressing worship and devotion, and emphasizing practical lessons for ristian living.

The position of the National Union blication, then, is that since the Chrisn school may properly leave some of e objectives of Bible teaching to the me, catechism class and Sunday hool, the school's primary task is to y a firm foundation of Scriptural owledge — or as stated there: to imrt "an intimate acquaintance with od through knowledge of the Scripres." While insisting, as who would t, that this knowledge goal does not any means exclude moral and emonal nurture, the stress deliberately is on "knowledge of the Scriptures" as mpared with the other emphases of me and church. On the other hand, u do not find such a distinction in n-Reformed Christian educational rcles.

I have not found it, for example, in e writings of those who in our time e setting up Christian schools among vangelicals. We find there an empha- s which is almost missionary in nature. Apart from the question of failing to be a school in this regard, failing, that is, to do a school's job with Bible teaching, the matter of a private organization which is not a church, and a layteacher who is not a minister, performing what is essentially the church's, and the minister's task, would be interesting to pursue. The Lutherans are more consistent on this score: while frankly holding to and aiming at a conversion objective in their Bible study, theirs are parochial schools.) The Lutherans play down the knowledge objective, and the general idea of formal and systematic Bible study in favor of what appear to be ecclesiastical and domestic objectives. In their *General Course of Study* are included sizeable blocks of catechism lessons. Their objective in teaching what they call "religion" is "to bring the child into the right relationship with God." Elements of this objective as listed may be summarized as follows: 1) knowledge of sin and its consequences; 2) faith in the grace of God, and 3) desire and necessary strength for sanctified living. Speaking particularly of the catechism instruction, the writer says: "the Word must be used to influence the emotions and will of the pupils for right behavior in all situations of life" (p. 11). And again, the aim "should be conceived in terms of spiritual advancement and not merely as a knowledge aim." Even through the discussion of objectives for Bible *history* runs the reminder that the basic objective is the saving knowledge of Christ.

It has, I think, been a Reformed assumption all along that the distinction between academic Bible teaching and the other kinds exists. Thus recently the Synodical Committee on Education reaffirmed the distinction and clearly showed that in its thinking Bible teaching in the schols should be what I have called academic, and what in the National Union's *Course of Study* is described as having mainly a knowledge-objective. After urging better integration and/or correlation of catechesis and Christian school Bible teaching, the Committee declares: "Such integration . . . would allow for distinctive emphasis on the part of each . . . For instance, the church's approach will be more authoritarian, personal, and intensive, as compared with the school's, which is more academic, formal, and extensive. The church's task is more that of bringing covenant youth to mature membership in the church as the body of Christ, whereas that of the school is to prepare for the kingdom in its broad cultural aspects" (Acts, 1951, p. 360). Speaking of the home in this same connection, we have this reminder: "The task of the home is primarily along personal lines, applying in an intimate way the training which a child receives elsewhere . . . The home should foster personal piety by direct precept, by example and through family worship. One of its specific functions is to teach children how to pray and to cultivate . . . personal and collective worship. It is the agency most directly responsible for teaching of respect for authority, the ethics of communal life, the obligations of stewardship of time and possessions, and the duties of cooperative effort" (Ibid P. 363-364). And when the Synod of 1951 adopted, for churches where no Christian school exists, the Committee's recommended auxiliary curriculum, it gave indirect sanction to the same kind of division of emphasis. For the language of this auxiliary curriculum (see Acts, 1952, p. 418ff.) makes it clear that the schools normally teach, and that in this case now the church must teach, a certain kind of Bible subject, different from what the church normally teaches, namely: a) Bible history and content, b) church history and c) Kingdom perspectives. Implied throughout is this, that Bible teaching in the schools should be content-teaching — systematic, extensive and foundational.

* * *

THE DEFINING of Bible teaching in the schools is an urgent matter. Some disagreement will, of course, continue. But if it can be agreed that such teaching is to be the formal, academic kind, somewhat as suggested in the foregoing, with both scope and proper concentration in good balance, there will be eliminated, I think, the duplication and overlapping all of us deplore. There will also, more important still, be guaranteed to the whole Christian community a certain kind of Bible teaching which is indispensable to a faith and a religious culture which claims that Biblical literacy is the cornerstone of this faith and culture.

Let the schools then be schools, also in the matter of Bible teaching.

LETTERS TO THE JOURNAL

Editor of the Reformed Journal

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

I do so hate to appear as if I impose upon you, but, please allow me a little space to answer briefly Rev. Verduin's reply to my letter in the *Reformed Journal* of May, 1954.

Rev. Verduin complains that I have not come to grips with the central issue of his article. That I did not answer all of it I do not deny. It was impossible to do so in a letter even as long as mine. I stated, "there is more, much more, in Verduin's article on which I would like to comment. But I dare not ask for the space it would require." If you are willing to allow me the necessary space I shall be most happy to do so whenever you can accept the material.

Hence I limited my remarks largely to a refutation of Rev. Verduin's contention that those among us who believe in separate Christian organizations are in principle committed to monolithicism and opposed to cultural compositism. As spokesman of one of those organizations that was my first duty. But how can one really mount an attack on something that exists only in the imagination of a writer? You see, we who believe in Christian organizations are as much opposed to monolithicism (meaning thereby the imposition of Christianity by edicts and force coupled with sanctions against those who refuse to accept) as Rev. Verduin is. And, we, too, believe in cultural compositism as defined by Rev. Verduin himself when he says: "By cultural compositism we do not mean a city divided into two camps, each on his own side of Main Street . . . No, by cultural compositism we mean folks with radically different loyalties living next door to each other." We are doing just that. I know of no-one, here, or in the Netherlands, or in Canada, who wants to do anything else. Rev. Verduin's charges miss us entirely. I repeat, who is he trying to hit?

I am sorry that an error slipped in when I quoted Rev. Verduin's statement that the claim of the brethren in the Netherlands "flows from the major premise that Christianity must have the "benefit" of a monolithic society plus the minor premise that American society is *not* monolithic." The underscored word "not" was omitted. Whether that was my error or someone else's I do not know—not having the original manuscript—but Rev. Verduin certainly knew that it was unintentional, and could have supplied the missing word. There was no point in omitting it. I do not follow Rev. Verduin's reasoning when he claims that by accusing men of proceeding from a certain monolithic premise commitment of such men to monolithicism is not implied.

It is not my desire either to debate the question of how many of Church related Americans are committed to Biblical Christianity. That was not the point. The point was this: that the argument of men who deplore the fact that in America orthodox Christianity —or for that matter Calvinism—is on the decline, is not met by pointing to statistical evidence that 60% of all Americans have some church connection, including in them all who have their names on some church roll, regardless of their orthodoxy or the religion to which they hold.

Neither is it fair to compare the voices of individual Christians in so-called neutral unions to the voices of Jesus and His disciples, to the voice of the Church, and the reference to separate Christian organizations in that connection is wholly out of place. I will leave it to the judgment of the readers whether the remark about the Trinity "a hip-rafter in the "Myth" of the Geneva of his day" can be properly compared with the Biblical reference to Jesus as the "head of the corner" of the Church.

I cannot, of course, refute the argument that New Testament Christianity makes for cultural compositism (as defined above) because, as already indicated, I believe in that myself. Before entering upon a categorical denial, beyond that already done, of the accusation that separate Christian organizations operating within society are "essentially nothing but remnants of the monolithic scheme" Rev. Verduin will have to offer proof for his contention. So far he has not done so.

I wish to reiterate my statement that the use of the term "two-camp Christianity" is confusing since it gives the impression that Christianity divided into two camps is meant rather than the world divided into two camps, or society thus ideologically divided, as Dewey undoubtedly meant it.

As to the "prism" which the brother asks me to discard I, frankly, do not know what he means. As far as I know my vision is not distorted or narrowed. It is focused upon one thing only: the promotion of the Kingdom of God in accordance with the instruction given us by our Lord: being in the world, working in it, claiming it for Christ; yet not part of it, which means separation from that which is committed to a philosophy that is hostile to the Kingdom philosophy.

JOSEPH GRITTER

SIGNIFICANT NEW BOOKS

BY LEADING REFORMED WRITERS

Now ready:

BASIC CONCEPTS IN CHRISTIAN PEDAGOGY 2.00
by Dr. Jan Waterink (Calvin Foundation Lectures)

GENIUS OF GENEVA (Life of John Calvin) 3.00
by L. Penning (Illustrated)

In preparation: (for Fall release):

YOU SHALL BE MY WITNESSES .....Sept. 1.50
by Dr. John Kromminga

THE SOUL OF THE CITY .....Sept. 1.50
by Rev. Jacob D. Eppinga

OF LAW AND LOVE .....Oct. 1.50
by Rev. Peter Eldersveld

THE QUEST FOR HOLINESS .....Nov. 1.50
by Rev. George Gritter

Ask for these books at your favorite bookstore
Also available through The Reformed Journal Reading Club